

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CEDRIC REID,

Plaintiff,

-v.-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK; MARTHA W. KING;  
CYRUS R. VANCE, JR.; LISA FRANCHINI; NEW  
YORK COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE;  
and LAURA S. MELLO, *in their official and  
individual capacities,*

Defendants.

20 Civ. 9243 (KPF)

**ORDER**

KATHERINE POLK FAILLA, District Judge:

On July 27, 2022, the Court issued an Opinion and Order (the “MTD Order”) granting motions filed by two separate groups of defendants to dismiss the amended complaint filed by Plaintiff Cedric Reid. *See Reid v. City of New York*, No. 20 Civ. 9243 (KPF), 2022 WL 2967359, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. July 27, 2022), *motion for relief from judgment denied*, No. 20 Civ. 9243 (KPF), 2024 WL 749620 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 23, 2024). Almost a year later, Plaintiff filed a motion for relief from the MTD Order pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(2), along with a request for leave to file a proposed Second Amended Complaint (the “Proposed SAC”) pursuant to Rule 15(a)(2). (Dkt. #84). On February 23, 2024, the Court issued an Opinion and Order (the “MTD Recon Order”) denying both Plaintiff’s motion for relief from the MTD Order and his accompanying request for leave to file the Proposed SAC. *See Reid v. City of New York*, No. 20 Civ. 9243 (KPF), 2024 WL 749620, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 23, 2024).

On April 3, 2024, Plaintiff filed a second motion for relief, this time from the MTD Recon Order, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) and Local Civil Rule 6.3. (Dkt. #94). The Court believes that the MTD Recon Order sufficiently addressed the issues raised in Plaintiff's April 3, 2024 motion.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the Court hereby DENIES Plaintiff's motion for relief from the MTD Recon Order for the reasons set forth in the MTD Recon Order.

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at his address of record.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 24, 2024  
New York, New York



---

KATHERINE POLK FAILLA  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> To the extent the City Defendants' response (Dkt. #92) to Plaintiff's initial motion for reconsideration (Dkt. #84) was submitted late, in contravention of the Court's August 3, 2023 Order (Dkt. #86) — which the docket does not reflect, but which Plaintiff nonetheless asserts — the Court hereby grants the City Defendants an extension of time to file such response *nunc pro tunc* to September 11, 2023, the date Plaintiff received the City Defendants' response via legal mail.